



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/081,776	02/20/2002	James M. Barton	TIVO0003C-D	4827
29989	7590	06/29/2004	EXAMINER	
HICKMAN PALERMO TRUONG & BECKER, LLP 1600 WILLOW STREET SAN JOSE, CA 95125			TRAN, THAI Q	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2615	14
DATE MAILED: 06/29/2004				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/081,776	BARTON ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Thai Tran	2615

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 03 February 2004.
 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-58 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1-58 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on 20 February 2002 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION***Response to Arguments***

1. Applicant's arguments filed Feb. 03, 2004 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

In re pages 2-5, applicants argue, with respect to claims 8-9, 13-15, 19-21, 23, 28, 36-37, 41-43, 47-49, 51, and 56-58, that Logan does not teach, disclose, or contemplate a system that **simultaneously plays back** at least two of said selected multimedia programs from said storage device or at least one of said selected multimedia programs and a multimedia program whose storage is in progress to at least one television monitor as claimed in the invention because Logan makes it clear that his invention can only process one recorded signal at a time to be output to video display unit and further does not teach, disclose, or contemplate a system wherein said playing back step allows playback rate and direction of each multimedia program to be controlled **individual to perform variable rate fast forward and rewind, frame step, pause, and play functions as claimed in the invention because Logan does not contemplate playing back at least two multimedia programs from a storage device which means that Logan does not contemplate allowing the playback rate and direction of each multimedia program to be controlled individually .**

In response, the examiner respectfully disagrees. First at all, the Office Action states that Logan can play back (see col. 3, lines 4-17) at least two of said multimedia programs from said storage device to at least one television monitor (**sequentially playing back at least two of said multimedia programs from**

said storage device but not simultaneously playing back as required by the claimed invention). The capability of **simultaneously playing the two multimedia programs is taught in Abecassis** (see col. 32, lines 56-65 of Abecassis). Thus, the combination of Logan and Abecassis as proposed by the examiner does teach the claimed limitation of **simultaneously** playing back at least two of said multimedia programs from the storage device because Abecassis teaches simultaneously playing back video programs.

Finally, Logan also teaches the capability of allowing playback rate and direction of multimedia program to be controlled to perform variable rate fast forward and rewind, frame step, pause, and play functions from col. 3, line 63 to col. 4, line 5. As discussed above, since Logan can **sequentially** play back at least two of said multimedia programs from the storage device, the user can control the playback rate and direction of multimedia program **individually** as required by claims by using variable fast forward and rewind, frame step, pause, and play functions.

In re pages 5-6, applicants state, with respect to claims 11, 17, 22, 39, 45, and 50, that the rejection under 35 USC § 103(a) is deemed moot in view of Applicant's comments regarding claims 8, 14, 20, 36, 42, and 48 above.

In response, as discussed above, the combination of references as proposed by examiner discloses all the claimed limitations of claims 8, 14, 20, 36, 42, and 48.

In re page 6, applicants state, with respect to claims 10, 12, 16, 18, 24-25, 38, 40, 44, 46, and 52-53, that the rejection under 35 USC § 103(a) is deemed

moot in view of Applicant's comments regarding claims 8, 14, 20, 36, 42, and 48 above.

In response, as discussed above, the combination of references as proposed by examiner discloses all the claimed limitations of claims 8, 14, 20, 36, 42, and 48.

In re pages 6-7, applicants state, with respect to claims 26-27 and 54-55, that the rejection under 35 USC § 103(a) is deemed moot in view of Applicant's comments regarding claims 8, 14, 20, 36, 42, and 48 above.

In response, as discussed above, the combination of references as proposed by examiner discloses all the claimed limitations of claims 8, 14, 20, 36, 42, and 48.

In re pages 7-8, applicants argue, with respect to claims 1-2, 6-7, 29-30, and 34-35, that, as discussed above with respect to claims 8, 14, 20, 36, 42, and 48, Logan does not teach, disclose, or contemplate a system wherein said decoding step allows playback rate and direction of each television output signal to be controlled **individually** to perform variable rate fast forward and rewind, frame step, pause, and play functions as claimed in the invention because Logan teaches that only one retrieved signal can be translated and controlled at a time which means that Logan does not contemplate providing a plurality of output devices wherein each output device extracts a specific video and audio component from said storage device, decoding each specific video and audio component into a television output signal, and wherein said decoding step allows playback rate and direction of each television output signal to be controlled

individually to perform variable rate fast forward and rewind, frame step, pause, and play functions as claimed in the invention.

In response, as discussed above, Logan teaches the capability of allowing playback rate and direction of multimedia program to be controlled to perform variable rate fast forward and rewind, frame step, pause, and play functions from col. 3, line 63 to col. 4, line 5. As discussed above, since Logan can sequentially play back at least two of said multimedia programs from the storage device, the user can control the playback rate and direction of multimedia program individually as required by claims by using variable fast forward and rewind, frame step, pause, and play functions.

In re page 8, applicants state, with respect to claims 3, 5, 31, and 33, that the rejection under 35 USC § 103(a) is deemed moot in view of Applicant's comments regarding claims 1 and 29 above.

In response, as discussed above, the combination of references as proposed by examiner discloses all the claimed limitations of claims 1 and 29.

In re pages 8-9, applicants state, with respect to claims 4 and 32, that the rejection under 35 USC § 103(a) is deemed moot in view of Applicant's comments regarding claims 1 and 29 above.

In response, as discussed above, the combination of references as proposed by examiner discloses all the claimed limitations of claims 1 and 29.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

Art Unit: 2615

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 8-9, 13-15, 19-21, 23, 28, 36-37, 41-43, 47-49, 51, and 56-58 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Logan et al (Re. 36,801) in view of Abecassis (US 6,553,178 B2) as set forth in paragraph #4 of the last Office Action.

Regarding claim 20, Logan et al, as discussed in the last Office Action, discloses a process for a digital video recorder (Fig. 1), comprising the steps of:

storing a plurality of multimedia programs in digital form on a storage device (col. 3, lines 4-17);

playing back at least two of said multimedia programs from said storage device to at least one television monitor (col. 3, lines 4-17); and

wherein said playing back step allows playback rate and direction of each multimedia program to be controlled individually to perform variable rate fast forward and rewind, frame step, pause, and play functions (col. 3, line 63 to col. 4, line 5).

However, Logan et al does not specifically discloses the newly added limitations "displaying a list of pre-recorded multimedia programs stored on said storage device to a user", "wherein the user selects multimedia programs from said list", and "simultaneously playing back at least two of said selected multimedia programs from said storage device or at least one of said selected

Art Unit: 2615

multimedia programs and a multimedia program whose storage is in progress to at least one television monitor".

Abecassis teaches an apparatus for randomly and continuously playing fragments of a video segment having "means for displaying a list of pre-recorded multimedia programs stored on said storage device to a user" (Figs. 4B-4G col. 16, line 24 to col. 18, line 32 and col. 37, lines 12-22), "wherein the user selects multimedia programs from said list" (Figs. 4B-4G col. 16, line 24 to col. 18, line 32 and col. 37, lines 12-22), and "means for simultaneously playing back at least two of said selected multimedia programs from said storage device or at least one of said selected multimedia programs and a multimedia program whose storage is in progress to at least one television monitor" (col. 20, lines 18-33 and col. 32, lines 56-65) to automatically customize version of a single edition of the viewer-selected video responsive to the viewer's content preferences for the level of detail and explicitness in a range of content categories (col. 2, lines 18-33).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the capability of randomly and continuously playing fragments of a video segment as taught by Abecassis into Logan et al's system in order to simplify the process of playing back the desired video signal recorded on the recording medium.

Regarding claim 21, Logan et al further discloses the claimed wherein said playing back step converts said at least two of said multimedia programs into television output signals (Fig. 10D, col. 40, line 60 to col. 43, line 31).

Regarding claim 23, Logan et al discloses the claimed wherein a user controls the playback rate and direction of a multimedia program through a remote control (col. 3, lines 18-26).

Regarding claim 28, Logan et al discloses the claimed wherein an input signal tuner receives any of: software updates or data (col. 3, lines 4-17).

Apparatus claim 48 is rejected for the same reasons as discussed in method claim 20 above.

Apparatus claim 49 is rejected for the same reasons as discussed in method claim 21 above.

Apparatus claim 51 is rejected for the same reasons as discussed in method claim 23 above.

Apparatus claim 56 is rejected for the same reasons as discussed in method claim 28 above.

Regarding claim 8, as discussed above with respect to claim 20, the combination of Logan et al and Abecassis discloses all the features of the claimed invention including the claimed plurality of output devices (col. 20, lines 18-33 and col. 32, lines 56-65 of Abecassis) and the newly added limitation "wherein at least two output devices simultaneously extract different digital broadcast signals" (col. 20, lines 18-33 and col. 32, lines 56-65 of Abecassis).

Regarding claim 9, Logan et al discloses the claimed wherein a user controls the playback rate and direction of a multimedia program through a remote control (col. 3, lines 18-26).

Regarding claim 13, Logan et al discloses the claimed wherein an input signal tuner receives any of: software updates or data (col. 3, lines 4-17).

Claim 14 is rejected for the same reasons as discussed in claim 8 above.

Claim 15 is rejected for the same reasons as discussed in claim 9 above.

Claim 19 is rejected for the same reasons as discussed in claim 13 above.

Apparatus claim 36 is rejected for the same reasons as discussed in method claim 8 above.

Apparatus claim 37 is rejected for the same reasons as discussed in method claim 9 above.

Apparatus claim 41 is rejected for the same reasons as discussed in method claim 13 above.

Apparatus claim 42 is rejected for the same reasons as discussed in method claim 8 above.

Apparatus claim 43 is rejected for the same reasons as discussed in method claim 9 above.

Apparatus claim 47 is rejected for the same reasons as discussed in method claim 8 above.

Regarding claim 57, Abecassis further discloses the newly added limitation wherein said playing back step plays back said at least two of said multimedia programs in a picture in a picture format to a television monitor (Fig. 10D, col. 40, line 60 to col. 43, line 31).

Claim 58 is rejected for the same reasons as discussed in claim 57 above.

4. Claims 11, 17, 22, 39, 45, and 50 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Logan et al (Re. 36,801) in view of Abecassis (US 6,553,178 B2) as applied to claims 8, 14, 21, 36, 42, and 49 above, and further in view of Mankovitz et al ('195 B1) as set forth in paragraph #5 of the last Office Action.

Regarding claim 11, the combination of Logan et al and Abecassis discloses all the features of the instant invention as discussed in claim 8 above except for providing inserting on-screen displays into a television output signal.

Mankovitz et al teaches that on-screen television guides can be used to select programs for viewing or recording (col. 1, lines 16-35).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the well known on-screen television guides as taught by Mankovitz et al into Logan et al's system in order to select programs for recording in unattended recording mode.

Claim 17 is rejected for the same reasons as discussed in claim 11 above.

Claim 22 is rejected for the same reasons as discussed in claim 11 above.

Apparatus claim 39 is rejected for the same reasons as discussed in method claim 11 above.

Apparatus claim 45 is rejected for the same reasons as discussed in method claim 11 above.

Apparatus claim 50 is rejected for the same reasons as discussed in method claim 22 above.

Art Unit: 2615

5. Claims 10, 12, 16, 18, 24-25, 38, 40, 44, 46, and 52-53 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Logan et al (Re. 36,801) in view of Abecassis (US 6,553,178 B2) as applied to claims 8, 14, 20, 36, 42, and 48 above, and further in view of Fujita et al ('619 B1) as set forth in paragraph #6 of the last Office Action.

Regarding claim 10, the combination of Logan et al and Abecassis discloses all the features of the instant invention as discussed in claim 8 above except for providing a multimedia recording device, wherein said converting step sends any of a specific digital broadcast signal or a television output signal to said multimedia recording device for recording.

Fujita et al teaches an image editing system having hard disk for storing the editing video signal (col. 2, lines 59-65).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the editing system as taught by Fujita et al into Logan et al's system in order to increase the quality of the video signal by editing the video signal.

Regarding claim 12, Fujita et al also discloses the step of providing editing means for creating custom sequences of video and/or audio output (col. 2, lines 59-65); and wherein said editing means allows any number of video and/or audio segments of digital broadcast signals to be lined up and combined and stored on said storage device (col. 2, lines 59-65 and Fig. 4).

Claim 16 is rejected for the same reasons as discussed in claim 10 above.

Claim 18 is rejected for the same reasons as discussed in claim 12 above.

Regarding claim 24, the combination of Logan et al and Abecassis discloses all the features of the instant invention as discussed in claim 20 above except for providing a multimedia recording device, wherein said playing back step sends a multimedia program to said multimedia recording device, allowing a user to record said multimedia program.

Fujita et al teaches an image editing system having hard disk for storing the editing video signal (col. 2, lines 59-65).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the editing system as taught by Fujita et al into Logan et al's system in order to increase the quality of the video signal by editing the video signal.

Regarding claim 25, Fujita et al also discloses the step of providing editing means for creating custom sequences of video and/or audio output (col. 2, lines 59-65); and wherein said editing means allows any number of video and/or audio segments of multimedia programs to be lined up and combined and stored on said storage device (col. 2, lines 59-65 and Fig. 4).

Apparatus claim 38 is rejected for the same reasons as discussed in method claim 10 above.

Apparatus claim 40 is rejected for the same reasons as discussed in method claim 12 above.

Apparatus claim 44 is rejected for the same reasons as discussed in method claim 10 above.

Apparatus claim 46 is rejected for the same reasons as discussed in method claim 12 above.

Apparatus claims 52-53 are rejected for the same reasons as discussed in method claims 24-25.

6. Claims 26-27 and 54-55 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Logan et al (Re. 36,801) in view of Abecassis (US 6,553,178 B2) as applied to claims 20 and 48 above, and further in view of Kobayashi et al ('254) as set forth in paragraph #7 of the last Office Action.

Regarding claim 26, the combination of Logan et al and Abecassis discloses all the features of the instant invention as discussed in claim 20 above except for providing wherein said storing step separates a digitized analog multimedia program or digital multimedia program into its video and audio components before storing on said storage device.

Kobayashi et al teaches a digital video audio processing apparatus having means for separating the digital multimedia program into its video and audio components so that the video and audio signals can be processed separately from the serial digital video signal in which audio signal is mixed (col. 3, lines 49-56).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the switching system as taught by Kobayashi et al into Logan et al's system in order to increase the quality of the video signal by processing the video and audio signals separately.

Regarding claim 27, Kobayashi et al also discloses the claimed providing means for synchronizing video and audio components for proper playback (col. 3, line 66 to col. 4, line 7).

Apparatus claims 54-55 are rejected for the same reasons as discussed in method claims 26-27 above.

7. Claims 1-2, 6-7, 29-30, and 34-35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Logan et al (Re. 36,801) in view of Kobayashi et al ('254) and further in view Yasukohchi et al ('837 B1) as set forth in paragraph #8 of the last Office Action.

Regarding claim 1, Logan et al discloses all the features of the claimed invention as discussed in claim 20 above except for providing separating a digital signal for digital television broadcast signal into its video and audio components and providing a plurality of output devices.

Kobayashi et al teaches a digital video audio processing apparatus having means for separating the digital multimedia program into its video and audio components so that the video and audio signals can be processed separately from the serial digital video signal in which audio signal is mixed (col. 3, lines 49-56).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the switching system as taught by Kobayashi et al into Logan et al's system in order to increase the flexibility of the system of Logan et al by allowing the operator or user to modify or change the video and audio signal as desired.

The combination of Logan et al and Yasukohchi et al does not specifically disclose providing a plurality of output devices.

Yasukohchi et al teaches a multichannel recording and reproducing apparatus having a plurality of output devices (102 of Fig. 1) for allowing plurality of users to access the video signal recorded on the disc unit (col. 5, lines 10-27).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the capability of recording and reproducing multichannel video signal as taught by Yasukohchi et al into Logan et al's system in order to increase the flexibility of the system of Logan et al by allowing plurality of users to access video signal recorded on the disc unit.

Regarding claim 2, Logan et al discloses the claimed wherein a user controls the playback rate and direction of a multimedia program through a remote control (col. 3, lines 18-26).

Regarding claim 6, Kobayashi et al also discloses the claimed providing means for synchronizing video and audio components for proper playback (col. 3, line 66 to col. 4, line 7).

Regarding claim 7, Logan et al discloses the claimed wherein an input signal tuner receives any of: software updates or data (col. 3, lines 4-17).

Apparatus claims 29-30 and 34-35 are rejected for the same reasons as discussed in method claims 1-2 and 6-7 above.

8. Claims 3, 5, 31, and 33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Logan et al (Re. 36,801) in view of Kobayashi et al ('254) and

Art Unit: 2615

Yasukohchi et al ('837 B1) as applied to claims 1 and 29 above, and further in view of Fujita et al ('619 B1) as set forth in paragraph #9 of the last Office Action.

Regarding claim 3, the combination of Logan et al, Kobayashi et al, and Yasukohchi et al discloses all the features of the instant invention as discussed in claim 1 above except for providing a multimedia recording device, wherein said decoding step sends any of a specific video and audio component or a television output signal to said multimedia recording device for recording.

Fujita et al teaches an image editing system having hard disk for storing the editing video signal (col. 2, lines 59-65).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the editing system as taught by Fujita et al into Logan et al's system in order to increase the quality of the video signal by editing the video signal.

Regarding claim 5, Fujita et al also discloses the step of providing editing means for creating custom sequences of video and/or audio output (col. 2, lines 59-65); and wherein said editing means allows any number of video and/or audio segments to be lined up and combined and stored on said storage device (col. 2, lines 59-65 and Fig. 4).

Apparatus claim 31 is rejected for the same reasons as discussed in method claim 3 above.

Apparatus claim 33 is rejected for the same reasons as discussed in method claim 5 above.

Art Unit: 2615

9. Claims 4 and 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Logan et al (Re. 36,801) in view of Kobayashi et al ('254) and Yasukohchi et al ('837 B1) as applied to claims 1 and 29 above, and further in view of Mankovitz et al ('195 B1) as set forth in paragraph #10 of the last Office Action.

Regarding claim 4, the combination of Logan et al, Kobayashi et al, and Yasukohchi et al discloses all the features of the instant invention as discussed in claim 1 above except for providing inserting on-screen displays into a television output signal.

Mankovitz et al teaches that on-screen television guides can be used to select programs for viewing or recording (col. 1, lines 16-35).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the well known on-screen television guides as taught by Mankovitz et al into Logan et al's system in order to select programs for recording in unattended recording mode.

Apparatus claim 32 is rejected for the same reasons as discussed in method claim 4 above.

10. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory

Art Unit: 2615

period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

11. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Thai Tran whose telephone number is (703) 305-4725. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon. to Friday, 8:00 AM to 5:30 PM.

The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

TTQ



THAI TRAN
PRIMARY EXAMINER